NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEST

At a meeting of the Area Planning Committee - West held at Council Chamber, Prospect House, Hexham, NE46 1XD on Wednesday, 20 August 2014 at 6.00pm.

PRESENT

CW Horncastle (Chair), E Armstrong, A Dale, RR Dodd, JB Fearon, I Hutchinson, JR Riddle, A Sharp

OFFICERS

P Bracken - Solicitor
J Green – Senior Planning Officer
K Norris – Democratic Services Officer
G Robbie - Principal Planning Officer
J Seaton – Rural Development Manager
N Turnbull – Affordable Housing, Senior Officer
T Wood - Senior Planning Officer

ALSO PRESENT

Councillor P Kelly

Public (29)
Press (1)

PART I

39. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Reid.

40. Minutes

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the last meeting held on 16 July 2014, as circulated, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

41. Disclosures of Members Interests

Councillor Riddle declared a disposable pecuniary interest in application 12/03579/FUL as he was a tenant of the applicant. Councillor Riddle would withdraw from the meeting whilst the application was considered.

Councillor Riddle declared a non-registerable pecuniary interest in application 14/01921/VARYCO as his wife held shares in Hexham Auction Mart Company. Councillor Riddle would withdraw from the meeting whilst the application was considered.

Councillor Dale declared personal, non prejudicial interests, in applications 14/00876/FUL and 14/01673/RENE.
Councillor Fearon declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application 14/01423/VARYCO as the objectors were friends of hers. Councillor Fearon would withdraw from the meeting whilst the application was considered.

Mr G Robbie, Principal Planning Officer, declared an interest in application 14/02108/FUL and would withdraw from the meeting whilst the application was considered.

42. Chair’s Announcement

The Chair asked members if they would agree to an additional meeting being held before the scheduled meeting in September due to the number of outstanding applications to be determined. It was acknowledged that all members may not be able to attend due to it not being a programmed meeting but it was considered to be the best way forward. Discussion took place after which it was:

RESOLVED – that an extra meeting of Area Planning Committee West take place on Wednesday, 10 September at 6:00 pm.

43. Determination of Planning Applications

The report requested the committee to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. The Chair also explained the process for how each application would be considered and the public speaking arrangements.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

44. 14/00792/FUL – Rear and first floor extension of existing 3 bed semi-detached bungalow: 86 Eastern Way, Ponteland, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE20 9RE

Julie Seaton, Rural Development Manager, introduced the above application which had been deferred from the previous meeting for a site visit which had taken place on 4 August. She provided details of the application and referred to plans and photographs on screen.

Mr Keith Melton, objector, spoke against the application and his comments included the following points:

- They did not object to the overall principle of development at the property but felt that the application was a massive over-development of a small property which would increase by 70%.
- People were becoming increasingly concerned about over-development and harmful changes to the character of the neighbourhood.
- The adjoining neighbour at no. 88 was overwhelmed by the proposal, her niece, herself a planning officer, had put forward concerns.
- The extension at no. 84 did not lead to a loss of light, if approved the extension to no. 86 would result in a significant loss of light to no. 84.
- The extension at no. 84 had not set a precedent; it was an extension to a
detached bungalow on a wide plot not a semi-detached bungalow on a narrow plot.

- It would be impossible to have 4 parking spaces and a turning area as suggested by the Highways Section.
- The street scene would deteriorate.
- There was a subjective disagreement between themselves and the planning officer, they felt there would be a loss of light and their view would be like looking at a prison wall.
- It was unfortunate that the site visit protocol did not allow members to go into their home to see for themselves.
- They hoped that members would conclude from the site visit that there would be a huge loss of light to their property and that the extension would be overbearing.
- He referred to an application in Ponteland which had been rejected as the scale and location of the extension would be detrimental to the neighbouring property in terms of loss of light, overshadowing and would have an overbearing impact on the outlook of the occupants. It had been stated that the proposal would be contrary to the NPPF and Castle Morpeth Local Plan.
- He reiterated that they were not against any development but they strongly opposed that particular plan which would be so harmful to their home.

Councillor Sue Johnson, Ponteland Town Council, then spoke against the application:

- The Town Council had been reticent about changing their objections to comments when the amended plan had been received and believed that the application should not be granted planning permission.
- They believed that the scale, mass and height of the proposal would have an overbearing, dominant affect on neighbouring properties.
- It would be out of character with the area.
- Although not specifically about retaining bungalows, the Castle Morpeth Local Plan sought to maintain characteristics of the area.

Mrs Hermina Ely, Agent to the Applicant, then spoke in support of the application and her comments included the following points:

- Both Northumberland County Council and the Darras Hall Estate Committee had been supportive of the scheme.
- Alterations had been made to address concerns put forward.
- The design had evolved as a result of comments from neighbours;
- It was a condition that hedges/trees be retained to provide screening.
- The neighbour had cut back many of the shrubs etc without permission.
- Right to light issues had been considered, had been investigated and feedback indicated that claims of right to light were a separate legal matter, not necessarily under planning legislation.
- Many such scenarios would exist on the estate.
- The current design met the needs of her client and had the support of the Council and the Darras Hall Estate Committee.
In response to questions, officers then advised:

- the ridge height of the proposed extension appeared no higher and almost the same as that next door.
- The Highway Authority had requested that 4 parking spaces be provided but it was not a condition, it had been indicated on the layout plan that the site could accommodate 4 cars.

Councillor Dale moved the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Hutchinson.

Debate then followed and reference was made to the site visit which had allayed members’ concerns regarding loss of privacy and amenity to neighbours.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

45. **14/00876/FUL – Alteration and extension to existing single storey double garage to create a one and a half storey dwelling: Land South West of West Wood, Newton, Northumberland, NE43 7TW**

Tamsin Wood, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application by firstly providing an update that a further application for a Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Development had been submitted but that the application was currently invalid.

She referred to the site visit on 4 August and provided details of the application with the aid of plans and photographs on screen.

Yoav Tadmore, objector, spoke against the application and his comments included the following points:

- It was an unusual site and access was difficult;
- He had concerns regarding the stability of the cliff;
- He had concerns regarding the soak away system, its effectiveness and location;
- Why did the applicants not start by establishing if the site was suitable for a new property?
- If permission was granted, he asked that concerns be conveyed to the building developer as running water could be heard;
- Other concerns had been expressed regarding the lack of detail in the plans;
- He was unsure as to what was considered to be an acceptable level regarding loss of privacy but over 3 sets of plans there had been a lack of concern regarding his conservatory – it was not just the issue of it being overlooked by the proposed development, it was the physical proximity, it was very close to his property.

Mr Moyle, the applicant, then spoke in support of his application:
• He thanked members for visiting the site which, he hoped, had given a more balanced view of the proposal;
• There was a mixture of designs and house types in the area;
• Planning permission had been granted in 1991 but had subsequently lapsed;
• The officer’s report stated the proposal would result in different eaves heights and various roof styles that would sit awkwardly in the street scene – he could not agree as these already existed in the street scene;
• With regard to scale, it was only 3 ft above the existing garage and 4 ft below the existing level – members would have seen the size and footprint;
• He disagreed with the officer’s comments regarding the footprint of the proposal as it was proportionate in size;
• He did not agree that the proposal was not sustainable.

Keith Butler, agent to the applicant, also spoke in support of the application:
• It was disturbing to note that the application for the Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Development had been invalidated 48 hours before the meeting;
• The proposed “permitted development” scheme was a material consideration and did provide a “fall back” position;
• It was disturbing to note that the application had been invalidated 48 hours before the meeting;
• The garage would not be demolished and replaced as suggested;
• There would be more off street parking and amenity space;
• The proposal was in accordance with the NPPF;
• On the site visit members saw many similar buildings and extensions and none of those were considered to have an adverse impact on the green belt.
• The proposal fully met the principles of the NPPF, paragraph 55, and would help to meet housing needs in South East Northumberland;
• The design was appropriate and would not impact on residential amenity.

In response to questions, officers provided the following information:
• Officers in Building Control would need to look at the proposal as part of the Building Regulations process, which would also assess ground stability arising from the proximity to what was referred to as “the cliff” for any ground works;
• In terms of village status, the Core Strategy referred to lists of settlements and whether they were considered to be villages or not. Previously, the Local Plan referred to groups of houses in the open countryside.
• In 1995 the property was converted to a museum, in 1990 planning permission was granted for a change of use to form 7 dwellings so the buildings were already there;
• This application was for a brand new house in the green belt so it was a different policy;
• There was no history of any other brand new houses in the area;
• In terms of the NPPF there were new guidelines at local and national level;
• If the application was granted it would be up to members to decide which conditions should be attached to it, there could be a condition regarding
stability.
• It was not necessary for the applicant to provide details regarding the stability of the cliff, if Public Protection had raised concerns, further information would have been requested.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed that the application be refused in line with officer recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Dodd. Debate followed and the following points were made:

• There was a need to be consistent when considering applications in the Green Belt.
• The area seemed to be an open settlement and the street scene was not that of a rural area.
• There were concerns regarding the cliff but assurance had been given that it would be looked at by officers in Building Control.
• The site visit had been very useful and the site was viewed from various places.
• It was small site with a compact house proposed on it;
• It was a legitimate infill on what was a Brown Field site.
• The proposal would not harm the Green Belt.
• The proposal would not harm the village, it would blend in quite nicely as existing properties looked new even if they were not.

In summary, Councillor Hutchinson said that regardless of opinions expressed the area was deemed to be Green Belt and some of the other applications referred to which had been approved had been for affordable housing which were allowed as an exception to green belt restraint. It was not a sustainable settlement and there was no public transport.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was defeated and therefore fell.

Councillor Dale moved approval subject to relevant conditions by officers. She stated that there would be no impact on the green belt, it was legitimate infill and was in accordance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF. The motion was seconded by Councillor Sharp.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that permission be granted as the proposal would have no impact on the green belt, it was legitimate infill and was in accordance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

46. 12/03579/ FUL – Proposed residential development comprising of 20 units with associated landscaping and infrastructure: Land North of Piper Road, Piper Road, Ovingham, Northumberland, NE42 6AY

Mr Robbie introduced the application and referred to an error in paragraph 7.30 of the report. He stated that the second sentence should have read “The process of understanding these “anomalies” is, in the words of the County Archaeologist,
“often subjective” and that it is rarely possible to identify the cause of such anomalies **without** direct intrusive investigation.’ He also referred to the last sentence in paragraph 8.5 which stopped mid-sentence and should finish by stating that the ‘proposal would accord with the provisions of the Core Strategy Policy GD5 and to provisions of the NPPF’.

In terms of updates, there were 3 further letters of representation which had been circulated to members and reiterated issues set out in the report, i.e. green belt issues and concerns about flooding data. Since the circulation of the late representations, an additional 3 letters had been received which also repeated issues set out in the report. On a point of clarity it was stated that a response had been received from the Housing Department and comments and input had been included in paragraphs 7.2 to paragraphs 7.11 of the report. The Housing Officer’s response indicated that they supported the proposal for the affordable housing scheme and a 10 year supply would be agreed as part of the discussions. The final update was that comments had been received from the County Ecologist who had stated that concerns had been addressed and he had no objections subject to a range of conditions and mitigation measures for the loss of the hedge. The recommendation remained as set out in the report with additional conditions regarding ecology.

In terms of affordable housing, this had been amended so that 100% of the site (all 20 units) would be affordable. The tenure mix was still subject to the Section 106 Agreement although it was anticipated that 70% would be for affordable social rent.

Reference was made to photographs and plans on screen and it was noted that the application was recommended for approval as it was for affordable housing and satisfied one of the exceptions for the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt.

Rachel Peck then spoke in objection to the application and her comments and concerns included the following:

- Concerns regarding inflow of water, the plans were based on a 100 year flood plan and objectors felt this needed more consideration.
- There were contradictions and discrepancies in the report, ie. Ovingham was referred to as a large village and previously referred to as a small village.
- A Housing Needs Survey in 2012 stated there was a need for the provision of 202 units per annum across the County yet the report stated there was a required provision of 242 units per annum to address current backlog of demand over a 10 year period – this suggested inaccurate data had been used.
- There was only one shop and one school in the village, most services would need to be accessed from Prudhoe.
- All options of Brown Field sites had not been explored in order to protect the Green Belt.
- There was a playing field next to the site and increased traffic would make it dangerous for children and vulnerable people.
- The proposal would have an adverse impact on properties in Dene Close.
- There would be an impact on the environment due to the loss of the hedge
- There had been 100 objections to the application and no letters of support.
- She requested that the Committee reject the flawed proposal.

Councillor Paul Kelly, Ward Member, then spoke in support of the application and his comments included the following points:

- Members were aware of Government Policy.
- The North East of England was very slow to come out of recession, it had a stagnant economy, Northumberland had an ageing population and there was a significant need for economic growth.
- There needed to be housing growth in Northumberland and it needed to be in proportion in all settlements in order to keep them sustainable.
- He had been involved in writing Tynedale’s housing policy 11 years ago which had recommended that the Green Belt was restrictive to housing growth.
- Negative growth resulted in the loss of young people to towns and it was obvious that in order to counteract the Green Belt policy in Tynedale there would need to be rural exception sites for social housing on agricultural land to provide social housing for those being pushed out of the market.
- This would be proportionate to the villages or settlements to which they would be put.
- He was well acquainted with flooding problems in Piper Road which had not been helped by the planting of Willow Trees along the drainage system.
- He believed the flood attenuation scheme being proposed would benefit the residents of Piper Road by taking pressure off the drainage and sewerage systems.
- The scheme had been significantly amended and the expertise demonstrated by those who had contributed to the flooding scheme was appreciated.
- The scheme proposed for swale was more than adequate for even a 1 in 100 year event.

Colin Barnes, Northumberland Estates, also spoke in support of the proposal:

- The application complied with planning policy.
- The NPPF made it clear that affordable housing was appropriate in the Green Belt, there was a strong need for affordable housing and there were no other sites in Ovingham.
- It was not a sensitive site; it was well located for services in a sustainable settlement.
- Drainage issues had been fully investigated.
- Northumbrian Water had advised recently they wished to use the site as an example of best practice.
- The Council’s number one priority was to provide affordable housing, there was an acute need in Ovingham and a lack of delivery.
- The proposal would provide 20 families with a decent home, Northumberland Estates took that very seriously and there was little financial gain in the site.
• There was a registered provider lined up for the site and as such it could be delivered in the next year or so.

In response to questions from members, officers advised that:
• The NPPF still required that Brown Field sites be considered first but sequential testing was no longer relevant.
• The site did meet requirements of a sustainable community under the core strategy.
• The original proposal was for a 50/50 split of market and affordable housing but after negotiations it had been amended to 100% affordable housing. A decision was still to be made regarding tenure but it was likely that the majority would be for affordable rent and the rest for sale.
• If members approved the application it would be subject to a legal agreement.
• If the application was granted and the applicant then submitted an amended application, it would be treated as a new application and considered as such.
• There was also current provision for revisiting previous planning permissions if there were blockages in delivering housing.
• If the scheme was agreed it would be followed up by a Section 106 legal agreement, the applicant had said the scheme was funded by an agency for affordable rent.
• Data used had come from local housing needs.
• If the scheme had been for a greater element of private housing the recommendation would have been different but affordable housing was an area of identified need.

Councillor Dale then moved the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Dodd who asked that sometime in the future roads into Ovingham would need to be looked at.

The Chair referred to the Local Development Framework Core Strategy which sought to address the problem of Northumberland's ageing population and the need to provide affordable housing within the NPPF guidelines. He understood the views of those in opposition to the application and agreed that the proposal would have an impact on the Green Belt, however, he felt that if the application was refused there would be little chance of it being upheld at appeal.

In summary, Councillor Dale agreed that many Councillors represented villages where people were unhappy about affordable housing, however, there was a need for it to be provided and she hoped that it would be retained for people in Northumberland.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED – that conditional planning permission be granted subject to a section 106 planning obligation to secure the provision of affordable housing to meet an identified local housing need and to retain as such in perpetuity, additional conditions regarding ecology and subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in
the report.

47. 14/01279/FUL – Residential development of 16 residential houses at the land south of Corbridge Road, Hexham: Land east of Farmways, Corbridge Road, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 1UL

Jenny Green, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and stated that clarification had been received regarding roofing materials which would be slate coloured concrete tiles. Ms Green continued to provide details of the application and referred to plans, photographs and diagrams on screen.

Mr Paul Wharrier, Hexham Civic Society, spoke against the application and his comments included the following points:

- Hexham Civic Society objected to the application for a number of reasons, details of which were set out in the report.
- It was suggested in the report that permission should be granted unless the proposal conflicted with provisions of the NPPF – the Society believed that the proposal was in conflict with the NPPF.
- Policy H4 of the Tynedale Core Strategy related to housing development on Green Field land stating that it should only be for affordable housing. If the proposal was permitted it would only provide a 30% contribution of affordable housing and was therefore contrary to that Core Strategy.
- Hexham was in need of more affordable housing not exclusive housing.
- It would not be sustainable development; the site was a 40 minute walk from the town centre.
- Reference was made to paragraphs 34 and 36 of the NPPF and it was stated that no travel assessments or travel plans were referred to in the report and he asked if these had been omitted?
- Reference to paragraph 35 of the NPPF which stated that plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people.
- Reference to paragraph 37 of the NPPF which stated that planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people could be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.
- In summary Hexham Civic Society did not believe the application should be approved as it did not comply with the NPPF.
- If, however, despite all arguments put forward, the Committee was mindful to approve the application, they asked for a condition to be included that a pedestrian crossing north of the A695 be provided, that the footpath on the south side of Corbridge Road be extended to the site and a proper cycleway, segregated from the road be provided.

Ian Cansfield, agent to the applicant, then spoke in support of the application and his comments included the following points:

- The application was for a well designed housing scheme and it was worth noting that over 75% of people who commented at the pre-application stage were in favour of it.
The site had been safeguarded for housing for a number of years.

The 5 year housing supply could not be demonstrated, there was still a shortage of housing.

The site was excluded from the Green Belt and should be considered for development.

The scheme would provide much needed quality housing, was compliant with the NPPF and local policy.

Improvements to the layby and landscaping would improve the approach into Hexham.

The scheme was acceptable in highways terms.

A footpath would be provided.

In response to members’ questions, officers advised the following:

- The Highways Section had originally expressed concerns about the layout of the site and access point but amendments had been made to the proposal and they were no longer objecting.
- No on-site affordable housing would be provided and it had been agreed that a contribution towards off site affordable housing would be made.
- A sum equivalent to the provision of 30% affordable housing provision would be acceptable and negotiations were on-going.
- The reason that off site provision had been requested was that a site had been identified in Hexham which was suitable for affordable housing.
- If there was to be a condition that the 30 mile per hour speed limit towards Corbridge be extended, it would be subject to a Traffic Regulation Order and because that was subject to consultation a condition could not be stipulated that an Order be in place before the development was occupied.
- If consultation took place, funding for that would be fully met by the applicant.
- Access could be designed to allow sufficient visibility.
- The public right of way would be retained and unaffected by the development.
- There was currently no footpath on the southern side of the A695 along the front of the site and a footway there was proposed.

Councillor Hutchinson moved the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Sharp.

A Member commented that, through time, it would be a natural progression to reduce the speed limit to 30 mph. It was also stated that travellers to Appleby Fair parked in the layby but that was not a planning reason to refuse the application.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED – that conditional permission be granted subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended plans showing revised highway arrangements, comments from the Council’s Ecologist and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure contributions towards: the Traffic Regulation Order(s); maintenance of the on-site play areas; off-site outdoor sports provision and
affordable housing provision.

48. **14/00981/FUL – Proposed change of use of former site of community centre (now demolished) to natural grassed sports pitch: Former West Wylam Community Centre, Broomhouse Road, Prudhoe, Northumberland, NE42 5EH**

Joanne Wood, Planning Officer, introduced the above application and referred to condition 5 stating that officers had been unable to clarify the exact wording regarding the adopted highway and asked that, if approval was given, officers be allowed to agree the precise wording. Ms Wood continued by referring to plans and photographs to show the access road, new access, the site from various views and the existing hedge which would be retained.

Mr Alex Waters spoke in support of the application and his comments included the following points:

- This was a rare opportunity to acquire a site to alleviate pitch shortages in Tynedale.
- The objector had been complaining about increased visitors to the site and lack of parking but there was adequate parking and they were looking to extend.
- The former Eastwood Middle School was adjacent to the east of the site, play facilities there had been used for the same purposes and they did not have the same parking facilities.
- There had only been one breach of parking since 1994.
- The site had been developed by Northumbrian Water to alleviate drainage problems and it was the contractors who had been parking on the footpath.
- In his honest opinion there would be no issue with parking facilities and notices would be sent to visiting teams instructing them where to park.

A Member said he assumed the application was before the committee due to comments from Prudhoe Town Council who stated they had not received enough information. He said he did not believe that was an objection and, due to the length of committee meetings, did not believe it was sufficient reason for the application to come before members. The Rural Development Manager said officers were mindful of that and the member’s comments would be taken on board.

In response to a comment, the Rural Development Manager clarified that officers had considered concerns and did not feel there were grounds to refuse the application due to parking or noise issues.

Councillor Sharp moved the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Fearon.

A member welcomed the proposal stating there was a shortage of Football pitches in the east of Tynedale. Another member stated that the area had been a focal point for vandalism so the proposal was welcomed.

In summary Councillor Sharp said it was an excellent application.
Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED** - that the application be granted permission subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

49. **14/00945/FUL – Demolition of existing garage and construction of 5 no. 2.5 storey, 4 bedroomed detached houses; Burnside Garage, Grange Road, Stamfordham, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE18 0PF**

Jenny Green, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the above application stating that there had been a sequential search regarding flood risk and officers were satisfied there were no other sites available. Comments had been received from Public Protection who were satisfied the development would not raise issues of noise or vibration. Officers were still awaiting further comments from the Environment Agency and County Ecologist. The application was identical to a previous application which had expired.

The site was not in the Conservation Area but was an important site in terms of the setting of the village. Reference was made to plans and photographs, on screen, showing the site plan, access and street scene.

Mr Michael Bell spoke in support of the application stating that members had kindly granted planning permission 3 years ago for an identical proposal. That permission had expired in June and he asked for approval for the current application which was also for family houses of a high quality design. He added that the families moving in would use the amenities in the village.

Councillor Hutchinson moved approval of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Sharp.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED** – that conditional permission be granted subject to further comments from the Environment Agency and County Ecologist within the consultation period and subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

50. **4/01423/VARYCO – Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission: 13/02873/VARYCO: Revisions to design and layout of the site and design of the four dwellings: Land North East of Lumley Cottage, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland, NE45 5LA**

Councillor Fearon left the meeting for the above item only taking no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Graeme Robbie, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the above application stating that the application site, which was tucked away in the centre of Corbridge, had a lengthy planning history, details of which were set out in the report.

Details of the application were provided and reference was made to the block plan and objections received. The main issues to be considered were the changes
proposed as it was felt these would have an additional impact to the proposal which had been approved.

In response to a request Mr Robbie clarified the boundary treatment stating that it was proposed to continue the venetian fence with a newly planted mixed species hedge with retention of the existing hedge in the latter portion.

A member stated that the original approval was for 2 ½ storey dwellings whereas the new scheme proposed dwellings with 3 floors. He asked if these would not tower above everything else in the area. In response Mr Robbie said it was more a case of how the space was used than increasing the height.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Gibson.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED – that conditional permission be granted subject to the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the additional Sports and Play contribution, and subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

51. 14/01673/RENE – Proposed installation of 40 ground mounted photovoltaic panels to generate electricity: Land South of Farnley House, Corbridge, Northumberland, NE45 5RP

Graeme Robbie, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the above application and pointed out an error in the report in that condition 2 should read “development should not be permitted”.

He continued to provide details of the application with the aid of photographs and plans. The site was in the green belt and the NPPF did not specifically say renewable energy schemes were appropriate in the green belt but said some could be inappropriate. Officers did not consider there would be an impact on the green belt and the application was recommended for approval.

A member queried if it would be possible to impose a condition to retain the screening which was already there. In response Mr Robbie said that in terms of benefits of screening, trees prevented the backdrop and he would question the necessity for that condition.

Councillor Sharp moved the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Hutchinson.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

52. Suspension of Standing Orders

When the time reached 9:00 pm, the Chair announced that in order to complete the
remaining business, the meeting would need to continue beyond 3 hours in duration. Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED** - that in accordance with the Council’s constitution, standing orders be suspended and the meeting continue over the 3 hour limit.

53. 14/01921/VARYCO – Variation to condition 2 (Minor variation of approved plans) from application 11/01058/FUL: Hexham Auction Mart, Maidens Walk, Hexham, Northumberland, NE46 1PU

Councillor Riddle left the chamber for the above item only and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Graeme Robbie, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the above application and reported updates received. Comments received from Public Protection raised many issues discussed during the previous application in 2011 which were largely reflected in the conditions set out in the report so would not propose any changes. Clarification was provided regarding condition 3 which made reference to PPG 13 which had been superseded and a correction in condition 10 altering the quoted drawing number so that it matched that listed in condition 2. Finally, there were revisions to condition 16 where the trigger points were contradictory.

The proposal was for a variation of permission granted in 2011, details of which were set out in the report.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed the recommendation for approval which was seconded by Councillor Sharp.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED** – that Conditional Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

54. 14/02108/FUL – Sub division of property back to two dwellings: Rose Cottage, Corbridge, Northumberland, NE45 5QB

Mr G Robbie left the chamber for the above application only and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Tamsin Wood, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the above application. The property had originally been two dwellings, was converted into one, and now it was proposed to divide it back into two. No external alterations were proposed and it was a straight forward proposal.

Councillor Armstrong moved that permission be granted which was seconded by Councillor Riddell.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED** – that Conditional Planning Permission be granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement, any further other consultation responses
and subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

55. 14/01507/FUL – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 22 no. 2-storey 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings with associated works: Former Greenhome Day Care Centre, Woodhead lane, Haltwhistle, Northumberland, NE49 9DP – request for pre-committee site visit

Graeme Robbie, Principal Planning Officer, referred to the above stating it was a major application. The committee’s approval was sought for a pre committee site visit to enable officers to bring the application to committee in September in order for it to be determined within the 13 week time limit.

RESOLVED – that a site visit take place on Monday, 1 September at 9:30 am.

REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, ECONOMY & HOUSING

56. Appeals Update

Members received a report on the progress of planning appeals, for information.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 9:10 pm.
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